

for the facts that can  
save the peace

---

**READ**

**Soviet Russia Today**

The only American magazine providing complete coverage, carefully documented *facts* and *comments* about the USSR and American-Soviet relations, edited by the author of this pamphlet. Each issue of **SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY** contains articles by famous correspondents and political figures who have traveled widely in the Soviet Union. Arm yourself with the *facts* by becoming a regular reader of America's *must* magazine.

*Special eight-month introductory offer — \$1.00*

---

**JOIN**

**SRT Book Club**

SRT BOOK CLUB brings you outstanding books on the USSR and American-Soviet relations. The Club's outstanding book selections thus far include: *Soviet Russia Since the War* by Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury; *A Guide to the Soviet Union* by William Mandel; *Medicine and Health in the Soviet Union* by Dr. Henry E. Sigerist; *People Come First* by Jessica Smith; and *Russian Literature Since the Revolution* edited by Joshua Kunitz. On the first eight books, members of SRT BOOK CLUB saved 50% of the publishers' prices. **FREE PREMIUM** on joining SRT BOOK CLUB, a year's subscription to **SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY**.

*Write for details*

**SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY • 114 east 32nd st.  
n. y. c. 16**

# Jungle Law OR HUMAN REASON?

The North Atlantic Pact  
*and* What It Means to You

*by* JESSICA SMITH

10¢



## NOTE ON THE AUTHOR

Jessica SMITH is the author of *Women in Soviet Russia and People Come First*, the editor of the American monthly magazine *Soviet Russia Today*, and a long-time student of the USSR and American-Soviet relations. Miss Smith has spent over five years in the Soviet Union, including an extended several months tour at the close of the war.

"contempt" of the Un-American Committee, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship has in the past year been pursuing its activities more vigorously than ever.

Through their initiative, Dr. Hewlett Johnson was invited to this country last fall. Refused a visa to come under the Council's auspices, his visit was made possible through the invitation issued him by a special Ad Hoc Committee organized under the leadership of Dr. Ralph Barton Perry of Harvard. Meetings held for the Dean in many American cities under various auspices revealed and stimulated the overwhelming sentiment of the American people for peace.

Since that time, the NCASF has been concentrating its efforts on bringing pressure to bear on the Administration to accept the repeated offers of the Soviet Union to reach a settlement with the United States, and now, through countrywide meetings and mass distribution of leaflets is spearheading a campaign to prevent its ratification.

The Committee of Women of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship is organizing special work for peace among women. Together with the Congress of American Women, which is also campaigning against the Pact, they organized a mass picket line to protest the arrival of Winston Churchill.

The NCASF has outlined a series of concrete measures to be taken by people in every community to make their protests against the Pact effective. The text is on the back page. We urge you to act on these proposals at once and with all your strength.

## The Way of Human Reason

To the increased military preparations against the Soviet Union engaged in by our country during the past two years, the Soviet Union has come back again and again with offers for peaceful settlement, which again and again we have rejected.

The stepping up of America's cold war policy has seen the promulgation of the Truman Doctrine of military intervention in Greece and Turkey "to withstand Communist pressure"; the Marshall Plan, now fully revealed as preparation for war; the Rio defense agreement tying in Latin America with United States military plans: the military treaty with Iran; the Brussels military treaty and President Truman's statement supporting it; the introduction of the first peacetime draft in our history; the passage of our staggering arms budget; increased appropriations for warplanes; and now the attempt to rush through the North Atlantic Pact.

All this has been accompanied by shipment of arms to China and Iran; American aid to help suppress movements for colonial freedom; establishment of new military, naval and air bases; standardization of our arms with those of Europe; ostentatious military, naval and air demon-



The obscene hysteria that surrounded the conference, the press and radio attacks, the pickets with their vulgar placards, their hoarse pro-war, anti-Semitic, storm-trooper taunts, the outright incitements to violence against the conference participants—all these were in fact instigated by the State Department's attitude. They were the result of the months of vicious anti-Soviet and anti-Communist propaganda that has accompanied our government's policies, now reaching their consummation in the anti-Soviet war pact. Having itself clamped down an iron curtain against a large group of cultural delegates, the State Department the day the conference opened issued a White Paper charging the Soviet Union with blocking cultural and scientific interchange; and then refused to permit the delegates to remain in this country to accept invitations to meetings and conferences in other cities to further such interchange.

The content of the conference, the many papers read and the lively discussions were rich and rewarding. Provocateurs attended every session, trying to create ill will and division, but the delegates, while giving them an opportunity to be heard, refused to be stampeded or intimidated and went about their business of exchanging ideas and working out a program of peace. The Soviet delegates made outstanding contributions at every session, answered questions freely, and at all times emphasized the ardent desire of their country for peace.

The main resolution of the conference pledged opposition to all military alliances; support for strengthening the United Nations as the best hope of peace; the continuation of the work of the conference; to arouse Americans to protect peace; and defense of the right to speak and think and communicate, and to maintain the Bill of Rights.

A continuing action committee was formed to implement the conference decisions for peace. Meetings throughout the country proceeded, even without the scheduled foreign guests, and the Committee is already engaged in carrying out a gigantic Roll Call for Peace.

The Roll Call, addressed to all Senators, declares that peace is possible, and that the United Nations is the last best hope for peace. It states that programs of rearmament and military alliance gravely intensify the danger of war, and that the North Atlantic Pact is the most immediate such danger. It concludes:

Therefore, we respectfully petition the members of the Senate of the United States to vote against the North Atlantic Pact and to call instead for the immediate initiation of long-term, top-level discussions between our government and the USSR.

## NCASF Campaign for Peace

Undeterred by the action of the Attorney General in placing it on the "subversive" list because of its work for American-Soviet friendship and peace, and the sentencing of its Executive Director, Richard Morford, for

# 1.

## THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

BEFORE concluding a peace treaty with our main enemy of World War II, our government has signed a war treaty against our greatest ally in that war.

On April 4, the representatives of twelve nations gathered in Washington to sign the North Atlantic Pact.

The original negotiators, under the leadership of the United States, were Great Britain, Canada, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, with Norway participating in the final stages. These nations were joined by Italy, Denmark, Iceland and Portugal.

The Pact divides the world for war instead of uniting it for peace.

It flouts the United States Constitution and the United Nations Charter. Its adoption, along with the program of arming Western Europe which it involves, would commit us to a course wholly contrary to American traditions. It would threaten the vital interests and security of our nation, and the welfare of free peoples everywhere.

The fight against the North Atlantic Pact is now the central front of the fight for peace. No individual, no organization can escape the responsibility of having helped to bring about a new global war unless at once, and with all their strength, they try to prevent it.

War is not inevitable, it can be stopped.

The Pact must be ratified by the United States Senate before it goes into effect, and it is the responsibility of the American people to prevent its ratification.

There must be a mighty mobilization of the people to protract public discussions and the Senate debate as long as possible. If ratification of the Pact is rushed through, then the arms program must be blocked, and the realization of its aims prevented. But the task will be harder then.

Now we must stop the Pact.

We boast of our American democracy. Let us prove that it works and that the people have the final say.

No one can declare that even such a dangerous step as ratification will make war inevitable. But it will bring us so much closer to the ultimate horror of war in the atomic age that a misstep could plunge us into the deadly abyss on whose brink we then would stand.



The Pact is motivated by a myth—the myth of threatened Soviet aggression. But the USSR, as the record shows, has committed no aggressive acts and will never embark on any aggressive war.

The logic of the situation therefore compels the following conclusions as to the meaning of the Pact:

1. That since aggression by the USSR is out of the question, those circles in the United States most vigorously pushing the Pact are seriously considering the eventuality of an aggressive war against the Soviet Union.
2. That while the Pact is ostensibly aimed against direct aggression from the outside it is in fact, since no such threat exists, aimed at keeping in power or putting in power reactionary governments which will support American imperialist policies, and aiding them to suppress not only the Communists, but all democratic movements within their own countries and liberation movements among the colonial peoples.

3. That the Administration sees in this Pact the only means of keeping the war hysteria and fear of the Soviet Union at a pitch that will make it possible to put over the staggering program of military production which it envisages as the only way out of the threatening economic depression. It is the American people who will be the victims of this tragic policy, for which they will have to pay in reduced living standards and the extinction of their civil rights.

## What the Pact Says and Means

*The Preamble declares that the signatories reaffirm their faith in the United Nations and their desire for peace.*

This lip-service to peace is negated by the Pact itself.

Faith in the United Nations would eliminate the need for the Pact. The Pact is in complete opposition to the One World principle on which the United Nations is based, replacing it with the conception of two hostile blocs of nations lined up against each other.

Faith in the United Nations has not been revealed by actions taken by its signatories even as they were solemnly agreeing on the text.

The whole foreign policy of the United States fundamentally violates the UN, either using it as an arena for furthering the cold war against the USSR, or by-passing it completely. Great Britain has violated UN decisions on Israel in backing Arab aggression, and in shipping arms to Syria and Lebanon. The U. S. shared this guilt by refusing to challenge either England or the Arab States to fulfill Charter obligations. The Netherlands has completely ignored the United Nations decisions on Indonesia, and the U. S. shares in this violation through Marshall Plan aid equivalent to the amount used by the Netherlands in attacking Indonesia. French actions in Indo-China are contrary to UN aims.

In abandoning their efforts to reach a solution on the Berlin issue, the

If the Administration, as it professes, sincerely desires peace, let it state its terms. Let the Russians do likewise, as they have clearly and repeatedly told us they are prepared to do. Let the heads of both nations, after preparations at the expert level, sit down to negotiate those terms. Peace will require compromise and accommodation on both sides. But no government that wants peace and knows its minimum demands can refuse to discuss them, and propose a war-creating alliance instead.

Why then should our government so fear the risk of conference and negotiation with the Russians while it incurs the incalculably greater risk of war?

Now is the time for the American people to act. The UN was born at San Francisco in 1945. The supreme question is, "Shall it die in Washington in 1949?"

Will history record that the fatal step was taken when the Atlantic Pact decision divided the world into two warring camps? With you who hear my voice this Sabbath afternoon rests the decision. In this vast radio audience are millions who know that the only road to peace lies through the United Nations and an understanding with Russia. To you I appeal to make your voices heard in Washington before it is too late. Let your Senators know that you want full hearings, consideration and debate on the North Atlantic Pact. Urge them to vote against a step which may destroy the United Nations and commit our beloved country to a course that would finally divide the world into two armed camps and take us down the fatal road to war.

The Young Progressives of America chose the anniversary of Roosevelt's death for a nation-wide mobilization to carry on the FDR tradition and expose the Atlantic Pact as a betrayal of it.

## Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace

A tremendous impetus to the peace movement was given by the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace. The Conference, organized under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions of which Dr. Harlow Shapley is chairman, was held at the Waldorf Astoria, New York City, March 25, 26 and 27.

Their call brought together the very flower of American life, people of varied professions and high achievement, people of divergent political views, but with a common concern to avert the horror of a new war. Thousands of people attended the various panel sessions, and 20,000 filled Madison Square Garden to overflowing at the final peace rally.

To the conference came a distinguished group from the Soviet Union, including A. A. Fadeyev, Secretary General of the Union of Soviet Writers, S. A. Gerasimov, writer, motion picture director and producer, A. I. Oparin, Acting Secretary of the Biological Sciences Section of the USSR Academy of Sciences, P. A. Pavlenko, writer and Stalin prize winner, and Dmitri Shostakovich, world famous composer. Guests were also present from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Romania, South Africa, India, Canada, Cuba and Puerto Rico. The State Department denied visas to delegates from Hungary, France, Italy, several Latin American countries, and all but one of the guests from England. Apparently they tried to prove their contention that the conference was "directed from Moscow" by attempting to limit the attendance to delegates from the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe.



was virtually unanimous that those present should return to their communities to do all possible to foster the fullest understanding of what is actually involved in this Pact and to encourage individual citizens and organizations to register their convictions with their representatives in Washington. Senator Glen H. Taylor (D., Idaho), participated in the conference and expressed his opposition to the Pact.

On April 10 an Open Letter to Congress and the President was released by Bishop James C. Baker, President of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church; Clarence E. Pickett, Secretary of the American Friends' Service Committee, and T. O. Thackrey. The Open Letter, signed by 300 distinguished churchmen, educators, writers and others, declaring that the present pattern could only lead to a war which no one could win, called upon Congress to reject the North Atlantic Pact.

The signers proposed a "constructive and honorable" alternative, based on a conviction that "capitalism and communism not only can but must live together in the same peaceful world." They urged President Truman, through a special envoy to Moscow, to prepare the way for direct negotiations with Russia to settle outstanding differences.

On April 15, a group of twenty-two religious leaders issued a statement warning of the Pact's dangers, urging full use of the United Nations for peace.

## Henry Wallace on ERP and NAP

The Progressive Party is in the vanguard of the struggle against the Pact. Testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in opposition to the five and a half billion dollar Marshall Plan appropriation, Progressive Party leader Henry A. Wallace stated on February 23:

I have said that the Marshall Plan cannot succeed in stabilizing the economy of Western Europe because it is not an economic plan for recovery but a political weapon in the cold war policy. The aggressive military nature of that policy now stands fully revealed by the proposal for a North Atlantic Pact and the lend-lease of arms to Western Europe.

Mr. Wallace declared that while the State Department's assertion that it had been unable in three years "to secure an adjustment of Soviet policy," constituted an admission that our "get tough" policy had failed—and yet the only course proposed by the government is to get tougher:

I therefore say that this policy of arming Western Europe, of establishing military bases near the borders of the Soviet Union—and 3,000 miles from our own borders—of building up Germany as an arsenal and eventually as a garrison—that this policy is at best the bankruptcy of American statesmanship. At worst, it is a deliberate incitement to war.

On Sunday afternoon, March 27, Mr. Wallace made a nationwide broadcast, vigorously outlining the dangers of the Pact. He ended with this urgent appeal to the Administration and the American people:

United States, Britain and France have violated the Mexican Resolution unanimously passed by the Paris UN Assembly, pledging the big powers "to redouble their efforts, in a spirit of solidarity and mutual understanding, to secure in the briefest possible time the final settlement of the war and the conclusion of all the peace settlements."

*The PREAMBLE expresses the determination of the signatories "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."*

How much freedom and democracy is there in the colonies of Great Britain, France, Belgium and the Netherlands? How much in Fascist Portugal? How are these precious things being safeguarded in our America today?

*In ARTICLE 1 the parties undertake to settle any disputes by "peaceful means," and to "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force."*

The Pact itself constitutes a threat of force, and a plan to make use of force. This undertaking is wholly inconsistent with our stubborn refusal to meet halfway the repeated Soviet offers for a peaceful settlement.

*In ARTICLE 2 the parties agree to strengthen their free institutions, and to seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies.*

But the United States' European Recovery Program, through its restrictions on trade between East and West, is already stimulating such conflict, and this military alliance against the East can only result in further restriction and conflict. "The free institutions" strengthened by ERP are the American monopolies, whose interests are served by it.

*ARTICLE 3 binds the parties to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack."*

This, of course, means only an all-out development of armaments and armies. It violates the UN resolution on arms reduction. It commits the United States to a limitless increase in its already staggering arms production program, saddles the people of Europe with the burden of paying for war material at the cost of their recovery needs, with the raising of huge armies which will divert their manpower from peaceful construction.

*ARTICLE 4 provides that the "parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security" of any of them is threatened.*

This too makes mockery of the pretension that the Pact is based on the UN. The UN Charter vests in the Security Council the right to determine the existence of a threat to the peace. The words "political independence" reveal the purpose of the Pact as an instrument to put down internal movements of the people, which could be extended even to a peaceful change by democratic processes.

This articles gives each signatory not only the right to raise the question of a threat to its own political independence, but to claim that the



political independence of one of the others is threatened. This violates the principles of self-determination proclaimed in the UN Charter. The Pact itself places all its signatories in bondage to the United States, endangering the political independence of them all.

ARTICLE 5 declares that an armed attack on one of the signatory powers is to be considered an attack on all, and obligates each one of them "to assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith . . . such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force."

Around this article much of the preliminary debate as to the Pact's Constitutionality centered, since the original wording spelled out explicitly the obligation of military action, thus taking the power to declare war out of the hands of the U. S. Congress. The final wording is the formula contrived so that in this country it can be said the Pact contains no "automatic commitments" to go to war, since "such action as it deems necessary" presumably leaves the decision to Congress.

This legalistic language does not change the original intent. James Reston of the *New York Times*, who has been the main State Department mouthpiece for the press, speaking in favor of the Pact at the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, March 23, said categorically:

I don't think any President in the future is likely to wait for Congress to declare war after the Congress has passed and the world has accepted our signature on Article 5.

This article bases itself on the right of self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter which is in no way applicable, as will be shown. The Pact also declares that measures taken under this article shall be reported to the Security Council, which means nothing since this would merely present a *fait accompli* to the Security Council, which is supposed to be the authority to decide on such measures, after armies were already marching.

ARTICLE 6 reads:

For the purpose of Article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France, on the occupation forces of any party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any party of the North Atlantic area North of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties.

It is important to note that neither Article 5 nor Article 6 contains any qualification whatever as to the nature of the attack, whether provoked or unprovoked, accidental or deliberate, major or minor, which would commit the United States to send armed help and plunge the world into war. Here is a desperate invitation to war provocation by any adventurist fascist group. A staged attack on a ship by a submarine; a tribal war stirred up in Morocco and Algeria, a skirmish promoted among occupation forces, even an accidental attack on an airlift plane over Berlin,

lyn, and his son and associate rector, Rev. William Howard Melish, because of the latter's leadership in the movement for American-Soviet friendship and peace. Both father and son have denounced the Pact.

Rev. Guy Emery Shipley, writing on "Stop the Cold War" in the *Churchman* of which he is editor, of April 1, called on the religious people of the country to use their overwhelming power by action for peace. Deploing the fact that in our country "peace" has become a subversive word, he wrote:

If those who draft and approve such resolutions as those passed by every Protestant denomination during the past year in behalf of peace with Russia are subversive, un-American citizens, then this country has in it millions of people who are subversive and un-American. It is time for the timid but vocal little groups of protectors of America . . . to be told the plain fact that the millions of *peace-makers* in this country will continue to stand for peace, no matter how many labels the *warmakers* invent, or how many lynching parties they organize.

The great Jewish leader, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, declared recently, "I am going to speak for peace to the last breath of my life."

The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends adopted a resolution on April 2 opposing the Atlantic Pact because it "implies further large-scale armament" and intensifies the division of the world. The resolution stated:

We urge upon our Government unremitting efforts to find a basis for ending the "cold war" with the Soviet Union. We call upon our nation to cooperate with other nations to halt the arms race which threatens to bankrupt civilization, which increase the danger of war and which undermines the "one world" concept of the United Nations.

In Madison, Wisconsin, eleven Protestant and Jewish clergymen issued a statement attacking the Pact. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a public statement has been issued in the form of a newspaper advertisement by a number of leading local citizens including veterans' leaders, women active in civic affairs, and outstanding Catholic laymen, as well as Protestant churchmen. In Minneapolis, the Minnesota Peace Education Committee of which a number of prominent clergymen are members, is organizing a campaign throughout the state against the Pact. In Boston a group of prominent clergymen have taken the lead in issuing a statement opposing the Pact and calling for the formation of a broad peace movement in Massachusetts. In Detroit, Chicago, Omaha and many other cities similar action is being taken.

Seventy national and community organizational leaders from 14 states met informally in Washington on March 16 to discuss American foreign policy and its implications. The Conference was non-organizational, embracing representatives of farm and trade union, religious, women's clubs, veterans, business and professional groups.

Discussion concentrated upon the North Atlantic Pact, and sentiment



President Truman from Cleveland on the anniversary of President Roosevelt's death. The letter declared that the cold war is taking heavy toll of labor's living standards and trade union rights, charged that war alliances could lead only to war, and urged negotiations for an American-Soviet Pact of Peace and Friendship.

On the same day 267 New York labor leaders, CIO, AFL and independent, published an advertisement in the *New York Times* opposing the Pact as a war measure and calling for full public hearings before the nation is committed to a course "fraught with peril to America and the world."

The CIO United Farm Equipment Workers convention on March 27 voted unanimously a resolution denouncing the North Atlantic Pact. The New York Executive Board of all local United Office and Professional Workers of America called for a petition to the President and the Senate, urging adequate public discussion. Other unions are following suit.

Many thousands of New Yorkers are demonstrating for peace as part of the campaign organized by the American Labor Party. Peace rallies are being held in every part of New York State and every section of New York City. House to house canvassing will carry the campaign for peace into the homes of the people.

American farmers are against the Pact, seeing it as a threat to their living standards and their lives. On March 22, at Denver, Colorado, farm delegates from thirty-five states attending the semi-annual board meeting of the National Farmers' Union, headed by James Patton, denounced the North Atlantic Pact as "directly contrary to American precedent and history." The farmers approved a resolution calling the Pact "a futile gesture."

Among the strongest elements in the people's movement for peace throughout the country have been the Protestant churches. While the Catholic hierarchy has been in the vanguard of stirring up the war hysteria, many rank and file Catholics are joining the peace movement.

At the conference in Cleveland called early in March by the Federal Council of Churches, 400 delegates representing thirty-five million American Protestants adopted an anti-war resolution which read in part:

We reaffirm our firm conviction that war with the Soviet Union is not inevitable, and we believe that it is improbable, given proper use by the United States of its powerful influence. . . . Contradictory ideologies can co-exist without armed force if propagated by methods of tolerance.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action is calling on all its members to support the stand of the church's Peace Commission against the militarization of America and Europe.

Countrywide protest has been aroused over the medieval persecution of Rev. John Howard Melish, pastor of the Holy Trinity Church in Brook-

could be the pretext for an all-out war—even aggression by a signatory.

ARTICLE 7 announces that the treaty does not affect in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of those parties which are members of the United Nations, nor the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Since the Pact is a military alliance aimed against the Soviet Union, and since the Soviet Union is a permanent member of the Security Council, any action under the Pact would be subject to the Soviet veto if this article meant anything. The Pact itself negates the Security Council's authority.

ARTICLE 8 says that none of the international engagements now in force between any of the parties or between any of them and a third state is in conflict with any of the provisions of this treaty.

This is not true. The Pact is in direct conflict with the British-Soviet Treaty of alliance and the Franco-Soviet Treaty, which pledge Britain and France "not to conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the Soviet Union."

The treaty is in direct conflict with the Yalta agreement, where Great Britain and the U.S., jointly with the USSR, solemnly declared:

Our meeting here in the Crimea has reaffirmed our common determination to maintain and strengthen in the peace to come that unity of purpose and of action which has made victory possible and certain for the United Nations in this war. We believe that this is a sacred obligation which our Governments owe to our peoples and to all the peoples of the world.

The treaty is in direct conflict with the Potsdam agreement, signed by President Truman, Premier Stalin and Prime Minister Attlee. It effectively destroys the three power unity pledged in the Potsdam plans for insuring the creation of a just and lasting peace and above all the agreed upon measures for Allied policy toward Germany and the conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany. The basic purpose of the policies toward Germany as announced at Potsdam was "to assure that Germany will never again threaten her neighbors or the peace of the world."

While the North Atlantic Pact nowhere mentions Germany, the whole policy of which it is the expression and extension is dependent on the rebuilding of the war potential of the Ruhr.

ARTICLE 8 further declares that "each party undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this treaty."

Read those words again.

If they mean what they say, they commit the United States not to enter into any agreement with the Soviet Union such as that proposed by Premier Stalin mutually pledging not to go to war. Such an agreement would violate American obligations under this Pact. Since the Pact becomes meaningless if the conditions of peace should be established, the Pact itself would bind the United States to reject all opportunities for a peaceful settlement with the Soviet Union.



Article 9 is of crucial importance. It provides for setting up a Council on which all the signatories shall be represented to implement the treaty, and in particular to "establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5."

Such a committee already exists in advance of the ratification of the Pact. For months a Military Staff Committee made up of the army, air and naval staffs of the Western Union powers has been functioning at Fontainebleau in France, where with the active participation of Major General Lyman L. Lemnitzer of the United States Army, plans for the provision of arms for Europe by this country and the organization of European armies to use them has been under way. It is from this headquarters, known as "Uniforce," that the commands will be issued to start the armies marching. The Brussels Treaty, which binds the Western Union nations, provides for automatic action by its signatories if any one of them is attacked. It is these military men, not the United States Congress, who will have the power to plunge our country into war.

Article 10 provides that the parties by unanimous agreement may invite any other European state "in a position to further the principles of this treaty" to accede to it.

This means, for example, Spain. The State Department has already made clear its intention of opening the way for Spain by trying to get the reversal of the UN resolution on withdrawal of Ambassadors from Spain. The U.S. White Paper of March 19 on the Pact also forecast Germany's eventual inclusion in the alliance.

Article 11 tries to conceal the unconstitutional aspect of the Pact by the statement that its provisions are to be carried out by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

Article 12 provides for the review of the treaty in ten years.

Article 13 provides that after twenty years any party may withdraw a year after its notice of denunciation has been deposited with the U.S. Article 14 provides that the treaty be deposited in the archives of the United States of America.

Let's see that it's buried there!

## The State Department Spells It Out

To eliminate any possible misunderstanding as to the military commitment undertaken in the Pact, the State Department White Paper of March 19 and Secretary Acheson in his radio broadcast and press interview on March 18 spelled it out clearly.

On the question of constitutionality, the White Paper explains:

Under the United States Constitution, Congress alone has the power to declare war. This Constitutional question, however, does not present a real obstacle to the pact. The United States certainly can obligate itself in advance to take such action,

finding a common language in the search and the struggle for peace. Millions more must join this struggle if freedom and democracy and culture and beauty are to endure, if we and our children here and throughout the world are to know even the simplest comforts and joys, if indeed we are to live at all.

Workers and farmers, artists and scientists, educators, people of all professions, church people and social workers, the Negro people, the Jewish people, people of all nationalities, men and women, young and old—who among them has not everything to lose in a new world war, everything to gain in a new world peace?

The workers, the common man, will bear the greatest burdens of the new staggering armaments required by the Pact in heavy labor, lowered living standards, lives regimented under a militarized system. Their broken bodies will litter the wide earth and the seven seas in needless combat from which few will return.

It is the shame of America today that the leadership of our great labor organizations is lending itself to and indeed promoting plans which are first and foremost directed against the workers and their interests in our country and throughout the world. Plans to destroy the great workers' republic, the Soviet Union, the new workers' states in Eastern Europe; plans that will equally destroy the workers of America. It is our shame that even the most progressive of our labor organizations has broken its ties with the world labor movement, the greatest single force in the world for peace. It is our shame that the labor leaders today are not even making a vigorous fight for the repeal of Taft-Hartley and the restoration of the gains made by labor under the Roosevelt Administration, let alone using their power for a change in the foreign policy that is responsible for the domestic measures costing labor so dearly.

But the rank and file of labor is awakening. The instincts that elected Truman were healthy instincts, however mistaken. The workers believed Truman when he took over the words of Henry Wallace and promised an end of Taft-Hartley, job security, housing, civil rights legislation. With the fading of their illusions about the Administration, confidence in the leaders who still support that administration will also fade and new, strong pressures from below will develop to demand new policies. This movement from below is already making itself felt in the broad people's movement for peace. The millions of workers who listened to Wallace and voted for Truman when he gave lip-service to the issues Wallace had clarified for them are now turning out in the big demonstrations and mass meetings for peace throughout the country.

On April 13 sixteen prominent midwestern trade union leaders, representing CIO, AFL and Railroad Brotherhood locals, launched a grass roots labor campaign against the North Atlantic Pact. It called upon trade unionists everywhere to join with them in a letter which they had sent to



*Street Journal* following its signing, quoted at the beginning of this pamphlet. This paper's April 5 editorial said bluntly that the Pact means the "triumph of jungle law over international cooperation on a world scale," the "substitution of brute force for the human quality of reason." This concept, declared this Wall Street organ, "fits the facts better than the ideally-human concept of the UN does." Wall Street is for it.

Contrary to general editorial opinion, many of the leading columnists are expressing strong opposition to the pact. Kenesaw Mountain Landis II, of the Chicago *Sun-Times*, speaking at the Forum of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations on March 23, called the Pact a "galloping extension of the Truman Doctrine" that the Soviet Union could only regard as a threat to its security. I. F. Stone of the *New York Post* applied a sharp scalpel to the Pact in a series of ten articles, in the last of which (April 1), he declared that the mentality behind the Pact is the antithesis of all that has made America great, and concluded:

It would rather risk war than peace, repression than freedom; has no real faith in free society or in ordinary men; it is drawn instinctively to war as a way out; it would plow men under. The fight against this mentality is neither over nor hopeless so long as you and I and the next man are still willing to fight it. The time to fight is now, before the Senate approves the Pact.

T. O. Thackrey wrote in an editorial in the *New York Post* on March 21 (before he was booted out of the paper for opposing the Pact):

The invitation to every tottering government to claim military assistance in crushing any opposition on the ground that its inspiration comes from outside national boundaries is clear, as the certainty that the more reactionary the government, the more prompt its claim and the more rapid the assistance. This does not, however, have a tendency to support democracy, but rather reaction and fascism.

Blair Bolles, director of the Washington Press Bureau of the Foreign Policy Association, in an article opposing the Pact in the *New Republic* for February 21, warned that the history of all military alliances was failure. The record shows that such alliances neither serve to prevent the outbreak of war, or insure victory if it comes. He characterized the Pact as "the most questionable piece of unfinished business that Secretary of State Dean Acheson inherited from George Marshall."

Those sections of the World Government movement which do not envisage a world united against the Soviet Union and feel that the only basis on which world government is possible must include the Soviet Union are deeply concerned about the implications of the Pact.

## The American People Mobilize for Peace

On the paramount issue of peace, transcending all other issues, unity is being forged among the most diverse sections of our population. No matter what other issues may divide them, millions of Americans are

including the use of armed force, as it deems necessary, to meet an armed attack affecting its national security. The fact that the fulfillment of a treaty obligation—as far as the declaration of war is concerned—depends upon the action of Congress does not inhibit the United States from making such a commitment.

In other words, either the United States Constitution is a scrap of paper, or the word of the United States is meaningless. Take your choice.

The White Paper avers that it is the intention of the Pact to remove the danger of miscalculation by any potential aggressor that he could succeed in overcoming his enemies one by one, and declares that if a similar clear indication of the firm intention of the free nations to stand together had been given early enough in the course of Nazi aggression, the Axis powers might well have stopped before they precipitated a war in 1939. This tricky statement does two things. It attempts to gloss over the fact that it was the Soviet Union more than any other nation which sought to get the free nations to stand together against Nazi aggression; and it attempts to equate the danger of aggression from the Soviet Union today with that from the Axis powers in 1939. This is a shabby attempt that characterizes all the anti-Soviet propaganda, the attempt to arouse against the Soviet Union the same hatred and fear formerly directed against the fascist powers, and to bracket the two. It cannot be too often repeated that the Soviet Union threatens no one, that its system is diametrically opposed to fascism, and the fundamental policies of the Soviet state rule out aggression.

While attempting to justify the pact as a regional arrangement under the Charter, Mr. Acheson in his broadcast laid great stress on the praiseworthy common interests of the nations of the Atlantic Community in "principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law," which he said had "universal validity." At his press conference, Mr. Acheson blandly described Portugal as meeting the test of these principles. When a reporter asked him whether Spain could also meet it, Mr. Acheson said that Spain had been kept out "by the unhappy opposition of certain countries," indicating a hope that this situation would be rectified. If an ideological region becomes the basis of reasoning behind the Pact, it is clear that this means an organization of the capitalist world against the socialist world, an attempt to prevent changes to socialist forms of government in other countries—a new version of Hitler's anti-Communist Axis. The test then, is not democracy, but opposition to communism, and American frontiers are thus stretched to global dimensions, reaching wherever governments can be found and maintained in power to oppose communism and people's democratic movements.

## Betrayal of the United Nations

The North Atlantic Pact, in spirit and in letter, as a whole and in every article, is in direct opposition to the principles and provisions of the



United Nations, despite all State Department protestations to the contrary. And every signatory nation will be helping to undermine the United Nations through violation of its charter and above all its basic principles of international cooperation and peace.

The Pact was originally negotiated by the United States on the basis of the Vandenberg Resolution passed by the Senate in June, 1948, which provided for United States affiliation with regional or collective self-defense arrangements in keeping with the UN Charter.

The pretense that the Pact is only a regional Pact as provided by Articles 52 and 53 of the United Nations Charter will not hold water. In the first place, the very word region is a misnomer. No mere regional arrangement is here involved. The area specified as coming under the Pact's jurisdiction spans half the globe, taking in the Aleutian Islands on the one side and Norway and Italy on the other. The colonial empires of the signatories reach into every continent and every sea. The text implies that the Pact can operate outside the region specified, and the accession of more powers is provided for.

Article 52, Clause 1, of the UN Charter declares that:

Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

The wording of this article indicates recognition of existing *local* arrangements for conciliation, not the sanctioning of new military blocs. It speaks explicitly of matters appropriate for regional action, clearly meaning settlements between states *within* a given region and not as between those of one region and another.

Article 53 of the UN Charter, dealing with military action, makes explicit the authority of the Security Council over any regional agencies.

The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state. . . . The term enemy State . . . applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

Thus it is perfectly clear that not only must any action for conciliation under a regional arrangement be referred to the Security Council, but that any kind of military or other action such as envisaged under the North Atlantic Pact is expressly prohibited and illegal under the United Nations Charter *unless authorized by the Security Council*. The only exception would be measures against an "enemy state" as defined above. No such measures are envisaged in the North Atlantic Pact. Its measures are directed not against an enemy but against a wartime ally. The Pact

Walter Lippmann, *New York Herald Tribune* columnist, has on a number of occasions taken a position similar to that expressed by Mr. Dulles, warning that the United States is courting disaster by trying to build bases so close to Russia. Mr. Lippmann, however, has long been a proponent of the "Atlantic Community" conception on which the Pact is based.

The flurry that earlier arose in the Senate over the Pact's constitutionality was quickly silenced by the State Department through the legalistic formula devised to conceal its automatic commitment to go to war. The State Department has expressed complete confidence in early ratification. However, the extent of the opposition that has been expressed by a number of Senators from both parties offers the possibility that the hearings and the debate on the Pact can be sufficiently prolonged to allow time for mobilization of the widespread popular sentiment against the Pact to bring formidable pressure against ratification. This is particularly true in relation to the arms program. Conservative Democratic Senators, like Walter F. George of Georgia have expressed concern over the economic difficulties which will certainly be accelerated if a new heavy armaments burden is imposed. And Republican Senator Taft and others have declared that they will vote for the Pact but not for the armaments appropriations.

Senator Forrest C. Donnell (R., Mo.), proposed that all members of the Senate be given an opportunity to question the Foreign Relations Committee on the ground that since the alliance involves the lives of millions and millions, haste would be a mistake of the "grossest, most unfortunate nature." Senators Burke Hickenlooper (R., Iowa), and Senator Arthur V. Watkins (R., Utah) joined him in demanding more time for discussion.

It has taken a lot of combing to pick out these voices of dissent, largely hidden by the press. Indeed only in *In Fact* (March 28) could one learn that on March 4 Senator Watkins had delivered a twenty-two page speech setting forth the constitutional and other grave problems raised by the Pact. Senator Watkins accused the State Department and the press of conniving to force approval of the Pact by making it almost impossible for a Senator to study, suggest or oppose one of the most delicate and dangerous treaties ever to come before them. He charged that hysteria had been whipped up to the point where even Senators are afraid to oppose our present foreign policy for fear of being accused of treason.

An important section of American business is opposing the Pact because of the realization that they will lose the benefits now derived from the Marshall Plan if government funds are diverted to armaments. Uncertainty and worry about war scares are doing more than anything else to inhibit business expansion and stability at home.

The most cynical comment on the Pact was that made by the *Wall*



## U. S. Criticisms of the Pact

Criticism of the North Atlantic Pact is making itself felt in some unexpected quarters, indicating that America's cold war policy is bringing us much closer to a shooting war than was intended by some of its most ardent spokesmen. John Foster Dulles, U.S. delegate to the United Nations is one of those now expressing fear of the Frankenstein monster he himself helped to create.

In a keynote address on March 9 at the Federal Council of Churches' Conference, Mr. Dulles stated emphatically that war with Russia is not inevitable. Declaring that the Soviet Union does not contemplate the use of war as an instrument of its national policy, he continued:

I do not know any responsible official, military or civilian, in this or any other government, who believes that the Soviet Union now plans conquest by open military aggression.

He warned, however, that if the USSR were to believe its home territory seriously menaced through major military aid furnished to European countries and the setting up of military bases on its borders, it could hardly be expected to remain inactive:

That is why our fellowship with the peoples of Western Europe and particularly of Scandinavia, ought not to seem to bring United States military might directly to Russia's border.

It would, indeed, involve a high tribute to Soviet leaders to assume that, under these circumstances, they would exercise more self-control than would our people under comparable circumstances, as, for example, if they had military arrangements with a country on our border.

Taking the position that a new war could only lead to a further spread of communism, as did World Wars I and II, Mr. Dulles suggested that the anti-Communist policy of our government could best be furthered by methods "short of war." The real danger, he said, lies in "the Communist tactic of propaganda, penetration, sabotage, terrorism." Thus it would seem that what Mr. Dulles is really afraid of is the Communists and peoples' movements of Europe and that his statements are not to be taken as opposition to the Pact itself, but fear lest our tactics in promoting it could push us into a war for which we are yet ill-prepared. No doubt he feels that time is needed both to build up a military machine now far from ready for an all-out struggle, and to bring in American aid to crush the broad peace movements in Europe, and consolidate American control of the governments involved.

While opposition to some features of the Pact such as expressed by Mr. Dulles is significant, it would be a mistake to think that there is any real split in bi-partisan circles on the over-all direction of American foreign policy. The differences are tactical rather than strategic, and Republican criticism should be attributed chiefly to the desire to impress upon the public that a Republican administration could do a better job.

has been negotiated completely outside of the United Nations. Its provisions are not subject to its authority. Action under it is merely to be "reported to the Security Council."

While the official statements on the Pact have constantly sought to describe it as a regional pact under the Charter provisions, the weakness of their position must have been apparent to the drafters. For the Pact itself makes no attempt to justify itself under Articles 52 and 53, but falls back on the argument that self-defense is permitted under Article 51 of the UN Charter. This is equally fallacious. Article 51 reads:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security. (Italics mine.)

It is clear that under this article self-defense means only temporary and provisional measures to repel an invader until such time as the Security Council can take action. It has nothing in common with any such arrangement as the North Atlantic Pact, which is an outright military alliance against an alleged potential aggressor of the future. This article, like the others, stresses the authority of the Security Council. Moreover, Article 39 of the Charter vests in the Security Council the right to "determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression . . . and decide what measures shall be taken."

The North Atlantic Pact nations have decided for themselves that a threat to the peace exists, and have named the aggressor in advance, although no threat of aggression exists from the Soviet Union, and under the United Nations Charter only the Security Council can determine the existence of such a threat.

Furthermore, Article 51 applies only to members of the United Nations, which Italy and Portugal are not.

Thus all attempts to reconcile the North Atlantic Pact with the United Nations fall apart, and the Pact is exposed as an anti-Soviet coalition in direct violation of the UN Charter.

That the North Atlantic Pact is actually intended to *supersede* the United Nations was revealed by British Foreign Minister Bevin when in a speech before the British Parliament on March 18 he said that the new alliance was made necessary because the UN had not fulfilled its purpose.

The effect of the signing of the Pact on the eve of the opening of the Spring General Assembly session was apparent in the pall of gloom that hung over Lake Success. Secretary General Trygve Lie had previously warned that "no regional arrangement can ever be a satisfactory



substitute for the United Nations." At the opening of the Assembly on April 5, Dr. Herbert Evatt, President, charged that the main difficulties of the UN lay in great power disagreements and declared pointedly that "all other obligations which individual nations or groups of nations may accept must be subordinate to and in accordance with those set forth in the United Nations Charter."

## Churchill and His Pupils

In tracing the background of the Pact, there are many historic points at which one might say it took its origin.

We might say it began after World War I when fourteen capitalist nations sought by armed intervention to destroy the Soviet Union, and when that failed organized a *cordon sanitaire*, a ring of hostile states along its borders—an earlier version of "containing Communism." Or we might say it began at Munich; or during the World War itself, when Churchill sought to delay the Second Front and to divert it to southeastern Europe, preferring to lengthen the war and lose more millions of lives rather than see the spread of Soviet power and influence. Or we might say it began at the death of Roosevelt, and the abandonment of his policy of blocking Churchill and pressing always for friendship with the Soviet Union, by an administration which listened eagerly to Churchill and followed his lead in treating the Soviet Union as an enemy.

Perhaps it began with the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima, just two days before the USSR entered the war against Japan. The British scientist P. M. S. Blackett, in his book *Fear, War and the Bomb* has suggested that the dropping of the bombs was "not so much the last military act of the Second World War, as the first major operation of the cold, diplomatic war with Russia," intended to assure U.S. domination in the Far East.

Or we might say it began at Fulton, Missouri, when Churchill took over Goebbels' evil "iron curtain" phrase, and, his speech "magnified and dignified" by the presence of President Truman, outlined the policy of Anglo-American leadership of an anti-Soviet bloc which finds its consummation in the North Atlantic Pact today.

This spring Churchill came again to our shores to gloat that the evil genie he conjured up three years ago has now taken monstrous shape and hovers menacingly over the people of the earth.

Speaking at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he referred to that speech, boasting that the plan he outlined was being realized "in Marshall aid, the new unity in Western Europe and now the Atlantic Pact."

Mr. Churchill revealed the whole purpose and direction of his life when he laid the evils that vex the world today to the failure to strangle

it. Prime Minister Einar Gerhardsen, who spent the war years in a German concentration camp, at first opposed Lange's pro-Pact line, but accepted it under pressure from this group. Meetings under the slogan "Down with Anti-Soviet Blocs!" have been held in many Norwegian cities. Powerful trade union groups passed resolutions against the Atlantic Pact and for acceptance of the non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union.

Denmark's Foreign Minister Gustav Rasmussen, supported by his Prime Minister Hans Heftrød, at first displayed reluctance about the Pact. But he arrived in Washington early in March to discuss the Pact, although less than a month before he had stated that the United States was not serving the cause of peace by insisting on the participation of Norway and Denmark as a condition for military aid.

The pressure of the United States won over the mounting protests of the Danish people against joining the Pact. In the article cited above, Gunnar Fagrell wrote, "It is scarcely realized how bitter feelings in Denmark are against U.S. control of Greenland," noting that the Americans had stayed on there, while Soviet troops had quickly left Bornholm. On the publication of the treaty, the Copenhagen *Daily Politiken* predicted much political trouble during the next two months when the treaty goes through its ratification stages.

Early in March a huge protest meeting was held in Copenhagen, attended by more than 5,000 people who heard from a series of speakers that a threat to peace and Denmark's national independence does indeed exist, but from the West and not from the East. This meeting and others passed strong resolutions against the policy of dragging Denmark into the Pact. On March 5, 8,000 women signed a resolution protesting involvement in a new, horrible war for someone else's profits.

In Iceland, too, resistance to the idea of becoming a base of operations in an American-instigated war has been very strong.

In Belgium, the Port of Antwerp was virtually paralyzed by a dockers' strike against the Pact on March 28. In Holland there have been popular demonstrations protesting the Pact, and even the Right wing newspapers warned that it was fraught with grave consequences for the Netherlands.

Throughout Canada, progressive organizations in many cities are actively opposing the participation of their country in the Pact, despite police reprisals, and a big peace mobilization is under way. Montreal has been plastered with posters reading "The Atlantic Pact is your death verdict. Struggle for peace!" In Toronto the youth are circulating leaflets against war preparations. In Ottawa and other cities large protest meetings have passed resolutions against Canadian participation in the Pact. American policies have backfired. They have aroused fear not of the Soviet Union but of the United States itself.



in the Gasperi government. They passed a resolution which said that "any pact that might sooner or later entail commitments" would be damaging not only to Italian but to European interests. Riccardo Lombardi, of the Italian Socialist Party wrote in *Avanti* protesting against the policy of shackling Italy to the Pact and making it an American colony.

The Swedish journalist, Gunnar Fagrell, wrote in the *New Republic* of March 14 of the difficulties faced by the United States in its attempt to bring the Scandinavian countries into a pact openly hostile to the USSR, since none of them had any serious animosity toward the Soviet Union.

Since it was impossible to bring Scandinavia as a whole into the North Atlantic Pact, the State Department scotched the plans of the Scandinavian countries to form an alliance of their own, and proceeded to work on the Scandinavian countries one by one, using the Norwegian Social-Democratic foreign minister, Halvard M. Lange, for this purpose.

Despite some support for the Pact among Swedish big business and military circles, Sweden has held firm in her determination to stay out of any alliance attached to a big power bloc. Mr. Fagrell described U.S. pressure methods as he observed them in Stockholm:

A stream of arguments came from the United States which have made it next to impossible to hold an intelligent conversation with any American representative in Stockholm. One and all feel the necessity to "put pressure" on whomever they meet. But they seemed curiously unaware of the fact that German agents a few years earlier had been heavily engaged in the pressure business and that the Swedes were somewhat weary of methods that evoked such unpleasant memories. "Confidential" information was handed out freely, rumors of evil intentions on the part of the Soviet Union were circulated. . . . The most amazing argument of all, however, was that Scandinavia would "be allowed no arms from the U. S. unless she gives up her neutrality."

All this, wrote Fagrell, led Swedish students of foreign affairs to the conclusion "that the U.S. wants the decks cleared for attack on the Soviet Union" since bases in Norway prepared for American planes, ships and troops, would mean a great advantage were a war of aggression contemplated. "In general," Fagrell went on, "it is safe to say that nobody in Scandinavia wants to act as vanguard in a war of aggression against the Soviet Union."

The Swedish government organ, *Aftonbladet*, said that the treaty offered "the security of a volcano." Large meetings throughout Sweden are protesting American war moves.

In Norway there is tremendous popular opposition to the Pact despite the stand taken by the government. The Norwegian people have not forgotten the role of the Soviet troops in liberating them from Nazi occupiers, the friendly agreement reached with the Soviet Union over Spitzbergen. The Norwegian Labor Party, which is in power, is itself split on the issue of the Pact, though its Parliamentary group supports

the young Soviet Republic at its birth. For it was Churchill who led the armed intervention against the young Soviet Republic, trying to force it back into a way of life forever rejected. The Soviet people, unarmed, beset on all sides by enemies, prevailed, because they represented the living future and not the dead past.

This is something Churchill and those who follow him do not understand. Looking backward, they still think in terms of old imperialist triumphs, and draw false confidence from ancient victories.

This confidence betrays them sometimes into speaking truth. Thus Churchill named as another error of the statesmen after World War I:

The doctrine of self-determination was not the remedy for Europe, which needed then above all things unity and larger groupings.

But is it not written in Chapter I of the United Nations Charter, to which Churchill paid lip-service in the same speech, that among its purposes and principles are:

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. . . .  
The Organization is based on the sovereign equality of all its members.

As after the first World War, Churchill sought to deny self-determination to the people of the Soviet Union, so today he and his American pupils are seeking to deny it to the people of Europe and indeed the world. For the aims of Anglo-American domination and Anglo-Saxon racism implicit in the North Atlantic Pact, deny the principles of self-determination and of national sovereignty to the peoples of Europe and all other peoples whom its tentacles enclose.

The "United Europe" movement fathered by Churchill, which has already taken partial shape in the Western Union, now incorporated into the North Atlantic Pact, is designed to destroy the sovereignty of the nations of Europe in order to facilitate Anglo-American domination. This movement seeks to do away with national consciousness and national sovereignty, to make these people loyal to a foreign power—ourselves. This idea was spelled out clearly in the resolution passed by the recent Brussels session of the European movement, attended by Churchill, which began:

In a world where political and economic associations of Continental scale prevail, the European nations cannot hope to remain in existence as independent economic and political units.

Churchill said at Cambridge, of the recent war, whose history he is again re-writing:

Once again the English-speaking world gloriously but narrowly emerged bleeding and breathless, but united as we have never been before. This unity is our present salvation, because after all our victories, we are now faced by perils, both grave and near, and problems more dire than have ever confronted Christian civilization. . . .



Only the English-speaking world is important to Churchill, only the English world won the victories. Forgotten the Russian glory. Forgotten the millions of Russian dead. Forgotten the one world which he planned with Roosevelt and Stalin. Forgotten the rest of mankind.

Having made his own purposes so crystal clear, Churchill attempts to lay the blame for everything on the Soviet Union, and to attribute his own aggressive designs to them. Only the atom bomb has kept the Soviet Union from bombing London, and communizing the world by force! Looking into the past, Churchill sees Europe about to be conquered by the Mongols, the "Asiatic hordes"—defeated then only because "the great Khan died." "They never returned till now," he cried, appealing in effect, for the overthrow of the Soviet government, and ending with a not-too-veiled appeal for preventive war against the USSR.

But the people of the world are looking forward, not backward. The future is marching with them and the future always wins.

## Arms Against the People

Actually the real key to the pact is to be found in the corollary measure for Lend-Lease military aid to the signatories which will be presented to the Senate to implement it.

The plan as reported in the press is that the State Department will offer a global military assistance program combining in a single package all present and projected United States commitments to supply not only the North Atlantic Pact nations, but Greece, Turkey, Iran, Latin America and other countries (not to mention the interlocking Mediterranean and Middle East pacts, as well as a Pacific pact already under consideration).

What the arms commitment will mean for Europe alone has been forecast by the demands already being drawn up in Europe. The Western Union powers meeting in London decided that implementation of the pact would require increasing their armies from the seven divisions now available to somewhere between thirty-six and seventy.

Since a modern division costs from two to four hundred millions of dollars to equip, the cost of the program would thus amount to tens of billions of dollars, to be provided by the United States.

For this staggering burden of armaments, the people of Europe will also have to pay, since even lend-lease of arms puts a burden on the recipient. The dubious benefits of the Marshall Plan will have to give way to the needs of militarization.

And even were the aims of the pact justifiable, seventy divisions would not mean security. The monstrous barbarism of atom bombing will not be decisive, and in the end it would be the land armies on whom the burden of the war would rest. But Hitler, with 240 divisions and the still undestroyed industries of Europe behind him could not defeat the

been the total flop of current British efforts to recruit military reserves. The *Economist* reported on February 19:

There is nothing the government can do to obscure the mere trickle of men and women who have entered the British reserve forces. The territorials (land reserves) have not reached 50 per cent of their target and the Royal Auxiliary Air Force has not reached 12 per cent.

The *Manchester Guardian* noted that people everywhere are viewing the Pact as an instrument of war and American imperialism. London's *New Statesman and Nation* is sharply critical.

Independent Labor M.P. Platts-Mills charged in Parliament that the visit of Gen. Hoyt C. Vandenberg was to prepare Great Britain "as an atom bomb base in an aggressive war against the Soviet Union, and that the United States was planning to make Britain its satellite."

In a dispatch to the *National Guardian* of March 21, Labor M.P. Konni Zilliacus wrote:

Let us face the fact that the world is being divided for war. . . . It is clearly untrue that everything has been tried to come to terms with the Soviet Union. . . . We have done everything . . . except to treat them as partners and not enemies in settling the affairs of Europe, Greece and Germany.

D. N. Pritt, K.C., M.P., and other leading British Socialists and M.P.'s are actively opposing the Pact. All sections of the British population are aroused and taking action against the dangers of war. The British miners say they will dig no coal for the Pact. Strikes and councils of action are being prepared to oppose the Pact and insist on peace in British and Scottish industrial centers.

In Italy, as in France, the Pact is equally criticized in Communist and non-Communist circles, although the Pope has thrown the whole weight of his influence in its favor. The powerful Italian General Confederation of Labor, representing 7,000,000 workers, has announced that it regards the Pact as a menace to peace and will call a nationwide general strike if the Italian Government ratifies it. Workers' demonstrations against the Pact have already been held in Rome and numerous other Italian cities. Italian youth are planning a peace conference in June.

The Pact was denounced by Christian Democrats and Socialists, as well as Communists, during the debate in the Italian Parliament. Left wing Socialist leader Nenni, former vice-Premier, appealed to the Parliament not to let France and the United States use Italy as an atom bomb storage depot, air base and battle field. Nenni said:

The Atlantic Pact is a pact of war, and what is more, a pact of war against the country which at Stalingrad shed its blood in our defense as well as in its own.

Even the right wing Socialists in Italy oppose their country's participation in the Pact. Their executive committee voted down support of the Pact advocated by their leader, Giuseppe Saragat, deputy Prime Minister



plan. We believe that British labor, that all labor regardless of political party, agrees on this. For the working class of France I can say that it sees no reason for a war against anyone. The working class of France says NO to this war plan. . . . France will never march against an idea; it will never march against the USSR. I say France, not the Communists of France, but France.

Throughout France work stoppages and popular demonstrations against the Pact are on the increase.

On February 28, the "Combattants de la Liberté et de la Paix," united front of former Resistance fighters, said in a letter to President Truman:

Our government is deceiving you in letting you think that the French people will consent to an aggressive war against the Soviet Union under cover of the Atlantic Pact.

Many elements in France have expressed great disquiet over the fact that the North Atlantic Pact violates the provisions of the Franco-Soviet treaty that neither country shall join a coalition against the other, as well as the fact that in France, as in the United States, the Pact violates the Constitution, since only Parliament has the right to declare war. On March 24 the newspaper *Populaire*, organ of the Socialist Party, which has five ministers in the Cabinet, charged that the government's handling of the Pact had created a situation where Parliament, which has been kept in total ignorance of the negotiations was faced with a *fait accompli*.

As part of the mighty people's movement for peace, a committee in Paris, initiated by the World Congress of Intellectuals in Defense of Peace and the Women's International Democratic Federation, has called for a World Congress of Fighters for Peace for the end of April. Prof. Frederic Joliot-Curie, head of the French Atomic Energy Commission, was elected President, and signed the call inviting labor unions, democratic organizations and leading writers and scholars in all countries to participate in the Congress, which said in part:

The main danger lies in the fact that millions of men and women are not yet aware of the menace involved in war preparations against the Soviet Union. We must drive back the war danger by joining the world peace congress.

Throughout Western Europe, Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union and Asia organizations representing hundreds of millions of people are passing resolutions in support of this great movement for peace and preparing to send delegates to forge a common front against the Pact.

In China, Communists and non-Communist leaders have joined in a resounding denunciation of the Pact, declaring that a new war forced on the world would find China allied with the USSR.

While the British Government has followed Winston Churchill's lead in organizing the anti-Soviet alliance, the British people as a whole are expressing mounting indignation over the role they are called upon to play. An Anglo-Soviet Peace and Friendship Congress is called for June. One of the sharpest indications of the anti-war feeling in Britain has

Soviet Union. And today the USSR can count on the friendship of other nations in Europe and the new China. Seventy divisions would serve neither as threat nor invading force—but only to keep tottering governments in power.

A major purpose of the Pact, implicit if not explicit in the text, and unquestionably a part of the calculations of its signers, is to help reactionary governments remain in the saddle and give them the means of suppressing democratic movements of the people.

In the *New York Times* of March 1, James Reston wrote:

The Executive Branch of the government is convinced that some of the Western Europeans must have military aid, not only to defend themselves against external aggression, but primarily to bolster their police powers against their own Communists. (Italics mine)

Secretary Acheson further confirmed this purpose of the Pact at his March 18 press conference when he said that while a purely internal revolution would not be regarded as an armed attack under the Pact, "an uprising inspired, armed and directed from the outside would be a different thing." Since no pains have been spared to spread the lie that all people's movements are Soviet-inspired, the meaning is clear. Asked whether what was happening in Greece would be regarded as an armed attack within the meaning of the Pact, Secretary Acheson said that in his judgment it very well might "since the United States has always regarded events in Greece as inspired by its northern neighbors."

The State Department White Paper of March 19 further underlined the aim of using the Pact for American armed intervention in internal affairs by saying that the military arms program now being considered by the Executive Branch envisages aid not only to Pact members but to "other friendly states in a free world," quoting the President's March, 1947 speech to Congress, in which he enunciated the Truman Doctrine.

## What the Pact Means to You

When the Marshall Plan was first proposed it was as a plan for the reconstruction and recovery of Europe which was also to insure the prosperity of the United States. It has failed in both purposes. We were told that aid for the economic reconstruction of Europe would make the peace secure and would make unnecessary a big arms program. The military aims of the North Atlantic Pact underline the failure of the Marshall Plan.

This failure is emphasized by the most conservative circles in Europe. On January 8 the British *Economist* wrote:

There is no means by which the Marshall Plan countries can, even with the present scale of American aid, prevent a serious fall in their standard of living in 1952.



Failure of the Marshall Plan for Europe means failure for the United States. The burden to American economy of the present scale of Marshall Plan expenditures was demonstrated by the efforts in Congress to scale down Marshall Plan appropriations. The supporters of the Pact insist that Marshall Plan commitments will be taken care of first. But if the present scale of Marshall Plan expenditures is difficult to sustain, how in the world is it going to be possible to finance the staggering armaments expenditures envisaged under the Pact?

While President Truman indicated that new appropriations will be necessary to arm Europe, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Administration's Council of Economic Advisers, declared in a speech on April 5 that the budget cannot stand this additional burden without the threat of increased inflation and grave dangers to our economy.

The cost of arming seventy European divisions is for land armies alone. It does not include the costs of increased atomic bomb stockpiling and the bombers to carry them to the Soviet targets that have already been charted by the war planners here, nor the vastly increased program of naval building that must accompany this plan. It does not include the costs of building and equipping the new military, naval and air bases that will be added to those with which we have already circled the Soviet Union. It does not include new global commitments yet to be considered.

The cost of all this, will be borne mainly by the American people. You will be paying for it out of your paychecks and family budgets.

We have already learned the direct relation of the cold war to our domestic interests. Our present arms program alone is already costing the American people a reduced housing program, the scuttling of rent controls, reduced expenditures for education and health, as well as the growing threat to labor and the people in the defeat of civil rights legislation and the unlikely prospect of Taft-Hartley repeal.

The cost to the American people was pointed out by Henry Wallace in his radio broadcast opposing the Pact on Sunday, March 27:

Our tens of billions of American dollars spent in Europe for arms cannot buy us military security. Nor can they buy us economic security. They will impoverish America.

Today, we are already spending more than half of our national budget on arms and the cold war.

With what results? Farmers, workers and small businessmen know the answer. Farm prices have fallen a third, business failures are increasing, and the grim lines of the unemployed again stretch around the block in scores of American cities, while millions of other workers are working only two, three or four days a week. The storm-clouds of economic crisis are beginning to gather.

But this is only the beginning. Wait until the Administration presents its bill for rearming Western Europe and Germany.

These are the costs Americans must count. We must count too, the drastic cost to the American way of life itself, which the Pact purports

In Indo-China it was the same thing. They expected America to be the champion of nationalist movements.

You can imagine the terrific letdown of these people when they decided America was on the side of the colonial powers.

The negotiations for the North Atlantic Pact are arousing still greater opposition to American policies. *New York Times* correspondent, Harold Callender, wrote from Paris on February 13:

It is the considered view of some outstanding European diplomats that the net effect so far of the negotiations and maneuvers in connection with the Atlantic Pact has been to increase the bewilderment and doubts of Western Europeans regarding their relations with the United States and with each other.

J. Alvarez Del Vayo wrote in *The Nation* of March 19 that a survey of non-Communist opinion in the various countries disclosed that the Pact's value is widely questioned.

In France there is tremendous opposition on the grounds of that very security which the Pact is supposed to offer. The most influential organ in foreign policy, the conservative *Paris Monde*, has reflected the widely felt distrust in the assurance against a third world war presumably offered by the Pact. Claude Bourdet, editor of the Socialist *Combat*, pointing out that at least a third of the population opposes the idea of placing France unconditionally in the Anglo-American camp, declared:

When such a large group believes that a certain policy, like joining the Atlantic Pact, will lead to catastrophe, it will inevitably try to thwart that policy by every means in its power. The courts will have little difficulty in building up a legal case of sedition, but the political problem will remain. And it will not be resolved by invoking a conception of treason at which the historian of tomorrow will smile.

Above all, Del Vayo continued, French critics of the Pact believe that the West should have exhausted every means of reaching an agreement with the East before taking a step which may make the gulf between them unbridgeable. He noted that it was not a Communist or a Socialist deputy, but an M.R.P. Catholic Deputy who on March 1 asked the French Government to invite President Truman and Premier Stalin to meet in Paris.

Georges Seldes, editor of *In Fact*, in a recent tour of Europe, found that the statements by the Communist leaders Togliatti of Italy and Thorez of France that they would not support their governments in a war against the Soviet Union represent the view of non-Communists as well as Communists in the labor movement. An article in *In Fact* for March 14 carries an interview by Mr. Seldes with Alain Le Leap, non-Communist General Secretary of France's powerful CGT (with 5,000,000 of France's 6,000,000 trade unionists), who shares this post with the Communist, Benoit Francon. Mr. Seldes was told by M. Le Leap:

We, in the labor movement, the non-Communists here as well as the Communists, believe that the West is preparing for war, and that the Marshall Plan is part of the



jected was the Soviet-supported proposal for the simultaneous signing of conventions for international control and for the destruction of atomic weapons, representing a major Soviet concession over its previous position that the first step must be the destruction of atomic weapons and only after that should the control convention be adopted.

The Soviet Union has insisted that the use of the atomic bomb as a weapon must be separated from its use for peaceful purposes. They agree to a system of international inspection and control to prevent its use for destruction. They do not agree to the U.S. plan which would give America monopoly control over all atomic energy, thus interfering with Soviet plans to use atomic power to create a more abundant life for its people.

The Soviet Union again presented the resolution on big power reduction of all arms, including atomic weapons, at the Security Council meeting at Lake Success on February 8 of this year, where it was again rejected.

Despite all the rebuffs the Soviet Union has received from our country, they have continued to hold out the hand of friendship to us.

---

### 3.

---

#### PEACE IS POSSIBLE

---

#### World-Wide Opposition to the Pact

The reservoir of friendship which Wendell Willkie once urged this country to cherish and replenish has been drained away. In its place we have poured a brew of suspicion, fear and hatred, to which the deadly poison of the North Atlantic Pact is now being added.

The conservative Republican weekly, *U.S. News and World Report* of March 25, published an interview with Joseph Fromm, its Far Eastern Editor. Under the heading "America's Lost Prestige," answering a question regarding his biggest impression after a three-year tour, he said:

I think the outstanding impression concerns America more than anything else. . . . I got the impression that the U. S. is playing with the world as though the countries were just chess pawns and there were no human beings involved.

There seems to be a tendency to think you can buy nations. . . . There is a revolution going on throughout Asia. It's a popular, mass revolution—right from the grass roots. But our policy, much of it anyway, is still based on the pre-war status quo.

At the end of the war, I was flabbergasted at the amount of American prestige. In Malaya, in Indonesia, people would pick me up and throw their arms around me.

to defend. This point is made in the "Open Letter to the American People" issued on March 19 by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, which said in part:

How will this North Atlantic Pact affect YOU? What will be its effect on YOUR daily lives? It means that your sons, husbands, brothers and fathers may be drafted for military service abroad, to man bases throughout this "North Atlantic area" from Portugal to Norway on the very border of the Soviet Union, to train foreign armies in the use of American arms. It means a drastic change in the American way of life—from the civilian direction of our society to the militarization of every aspect of our lives.

It means that you will live in the shadow of war every day, every hour. If the world becomes an armed camp there is no security for any of us. This, and not the attitude of any one nation, may make war inevitable.

The prosecution of the cold war has already been accompanied by unprecedented assaults upon the democratic liberties of our people. More and more our country is itself becoming the prototype of the police state regime our policies profess to oppose. The loyalty tests, the subversive lists, the spy scares, all these will pale before what we will have to face under the type of militarization the North Atlantic Pact and our arms programs will involve. Already, those who speak for American-Soviet friendship are branded as traitors. This will spread to all who speak and work for peace if we permit Congress to pass the North Atlantic Pact and the arms bill. One state after another is passing unprecedented legislation in violation of all our traditions of civil liberties. The present trial of twelve Communist leaders, on the fantastic charge of "conspiring to organize the Communist Party to teach and advocate overthrow and destruction of the United States government" is being staged to pave the way for the outlawing of the Communist Party. Through this trial, the government is trying to show that all Communists are traitors, and owe their allegiance to a foreign power, in order to bolster their position that the capitalist powers everywhere are faced with "indirect aggression" from within which American arms must put down. Let the American people not forget that the trial is aimed not alone at Communists but at all progressive forces, and that the outlawing of the Communist Party in Germany was followed by the suppression of trade unions and all democratic movements of the people, as fascism tightened its grip.



## 2.

### THERE IS NO THREAT FROM THE USSR

#### The Reaction of the Soviet Union

Since the professed purpose of the North Atlantic Pact is to ease world tension and create security against the supposed "threat" from the Soviet Union, it would have been reasonable to expect the authors of the pact to display special concern for the attitude of the Soviet Union, which was made clear from the beginning.

On January 29th, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR issued a White Paper on the pact which was not, however, published in full in any American publication but *Soviet Russia Today*.\*

This Soviet White Paper traced the development of the pact since March, 1948, when the Brussels pact was concluded between Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, laying the foundations for a Western Union bloc. The White Paper charged that the inclusion of the Western Union nations in the North Atlantic Pact, in conjunction with the already existing Inter-American Pact, could only be taken as part of a plan for establishing Anglo-American world domination and the policy of unleashing a new world war, and could only mean the undermining of the United Nations, whose existence serves to curb aggressive policies.

When American pressure on the Scandinavian countries to join the Pact became evident, the Soviet Union took the natural step of inquiring of Norway just what her intentions were, and specifically whether she intended to give the United States military bases in Norway. Already surrounded on all sides by United States military, naval and air bases, the Soviet Union could hardly have welcomed the development of military bases in a country with which she had a common border. The Soviet inquiries were widely reported in the press at the time as "threats" to Norway.

After Norwegian Foreign Minister Lange returned to Norway from his first visit to Washington, he replied to the Soviet Union that joining the North Atlantic Pact, he had been assured, would not necessitate giving

defense, and to gain time to prepare for the conflict in which they knew they must ultimately take part, the Soviet leaders concluded a non-aggression pact with Germany. Not an alliance, it should be remembered, a non-aggression pact.

And when the German invasion brought the Soviet Union into the war—while the United States was still a non-combatant—it was the Soviet Union that played the greatest part in forging the alliance of the democratic powers which brought the final victory over the aggressor nations. And it was the Soviet Union, along with the America then truly represented by Franklin D. Roosevelt, which exerted the greatest efforts to insure the continuing of that alliance into the peace.

Since the end of the war, the Soviet Union has sought steadfastly to adhere to its wartime agreements. It has taken no aggressive actions, threatened no one, built no military bases anywhere in the world. There are no Soviet troops to be found in any of the trouble spots today where blood is flowing. They have withdrawn their troops from China, while U.S. forces remain. They have withdrawn their troops from North Korea, though American occupation armies remain in the South. They have been gradually reducing their occupation forces everywhere.

The Soviet moves within the United Nations have been in line with its basic principles. It is not they who have been the obstructionists, as charged, nor they who have destroyed its effectiveness and prestige, but the Anglo-American bloc which has used it as an arena for the cold war when they have not by-passed it completely.

The Soviet Union has consistently supported the principle of unanimity, the veto power, a fundamental principle supported by President Roosevelt without which the Senate would never have ratified the United Nations Charter. The principle was established in order to provide full opportunity for harmonizing the interests of the great powers. But on one occasion after another England and America have refused to try to reach settlement, have forced issues to a vote before agreement could be reached, compelling the USSR to make use of the veto. The USSR has never used the veto against the interests of the United Nations, but only in the interests of upholding its basic principles and maintaining peace.

It was the Soviet Union that first initiated the move for a general disarmament program embodied in a resolution which was the outstanding achievement of the United Nations General Assembly session at Lake Success at the end of 1946.

At the 1948 General Assembly session in Paris, the first move on the part of the Soviet Union was Vyshinsky's proposal to implement the UN disarmament resolution by a one-third reduction within one year of all armed forces by the Big Five. The rejection of this Soviet proposal was likewise a repudiation of the UN's own disarmament resolution. Also re-

\* Reprints available from the office of Soviet Russia Today at 5¢ a copy, or 3¢ each for bulk orders.



It needs no foreign markets, no colonies to produce profits for investors. The peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union is the natural extension of its internal policy of peaceful construction.

While it is true that both the first and second world wars resulted in growth of Communist power and influence, this was a by-product, and neither the Soviet Union nor Communists anywhere in the world have ever advocated war or chaos as a method of promoting communism. They believe that peaceful collaboration and peaceful competition with capitalism offer the best means of conclusively demonstrating the superiority of the socialist system.

The first act of the young Soviet government when it came to power in the midst of the first World War was its historic Decree of Peace of November 8, 1917, written by Lenin.

Lenin opposed Trotsky's theory of "permanent revolution" which held that socialism could not succeed in one country alone, but only on an international scale, in the arena of world proletarian revolution, actively organized by the Soviet state. Lenin's view, which prevailed, was that socialism could be built in one country, without intervention in any other, and this was the basis on which he set about establishing the peaceful trade and diplomatic relations essential for socialist construction.

Stalin has continued the Leninist foreign policy. He carried to conclusion the building of socialism and has done everything possible to maintain and develop the peaceful foreign relations necessary for its full flowering. The Constitution he fathered provides for a declaration of war only in case of aggression against the USSR. In words and deeds the Soviet Government has consistently advocated the policy of peaceful co-existence of the capitalist and socialist systems.

Year in and year out Stalin has reaffirmed this belief to foreign visitors and newspapermen, and the policy has been widely publicized among the Soviet people. All the efforts of the big brains of the State Department to prove that statements supporting the idea of peaceful co-existence are a trick to fool the outside world and are for foreign consumption only, cannot change the record of history.

The record of history shows, too, that between the two world wars it was the Soviet Union that took the leadership in advocating armaments reduction and a system of collective security. It was the Soviet Union that issued the first warnings on the menace of fascism. Even after Munich, the Soviet Union sought to reach an agreement with the democratic powers. It was only when it became clear that the long negotiations with England and France were futile, because those countries had no intention of coming to an agreement with the Soviet Union, preferring to reach agreement with the fascist powers to turn their aggression eastward, that the Soviet Union was compelled to turn to other methods. They negotiated up to the ultimate moment of danger. Then, in self-

bases to America in case of direct attack or threat of attack. (The State Department had let it be known however, through James Reston, that if Norway came into the pact it would be hoped "she would realize of her own volition that her airfields would have to meet certain specifications, and her ports have certain facilities if direct United States assistance, during a war, were to be effective." *New York Times*, February 11.)

The Soviet reply pointed out the dangers of the Norwegian position regarding military bases, since mere provocative rumors of threatened attack might be deemed sufficient for the granting of such bases to other powers. The Soviet Union reiterated its friendly attitude toward Norway, and concluded with the proposal of a non-aggression pact to put an end to any doubts Norway might have with regard to Soviet intentions. But Norway chose to join the pact of war against the Soviet Union instead of the pact of peace offered by the latter.

The Soviet Union delivered a memorandum on the Pact to all of its signatories but Portugal, with which she has no diplomatic relations. The memorandum noted that the published text fully confirmed the charges in the January 29 statement regarding the aggressive aims of the treaty and the fact that it is counter to the principles and aims of the United Nations and to the commitments of the United States, Great Britain and France under other treaties and agreements, such as the Yalta and Potsdam pacts, and the Anglo-Soviet and Franco-Soviet treaties.

The memorandum charged that the fact that the Soviet Union alone among the great powers is excluded can mean only that the treaty is directed against the Soviet Union.

It noted that the effort to justify the treaty on the ground that the Soviet Union has defensive treaties with the Eastern European democracies is completely untenable, explaining that these are bi-lateral treaties of friendship and mutual assistance directed solely against the possible repetition of German aggression, and in no way against the Allies of the USSR in the late war, and are similar to treaties it has with Great Britain and France.

The memorandum declared that the North Atlantic Treaty is a multi-lateral treaty aimed not against a repetition of German aggression, but against one of the chief allies of the war.

The Soviet note listed extensive military measures being carried out by the participants in the North Atlantic Treaty which can in no way be justified by self-defense interests, and are not an indication of peace-loving aims, but "contribute to intensifying anxiety and alarm and to the whipping up of war hysteria."

The Soviet note emphasized the peaceful intentions of the USSR:

... One cannot but see the groundlessness of the anti-Soviet motives of the North Atlantic Treaty, inasmuch as it is known to all that the Soviet Union does



are never considered sufficient to justify territorial acquisitions. The desires of the people are the paramount consideration, and the Soviet Union has never sought to acquire territories with dissident populations. Any such action would be against its policy of self-determination of peoples, and indeed against its own interests and security.

Finland was an ally of Hitler and an enemy of the Allies in World War II. In the 29-month siege of Leningrad, the longest siege ever endured by any city, German and Finnish artillery poured incessant fire into Leningrad. Finnish occupiers of Soviet territory were guilty of atrocities as horrible as those perpetrated by the Nazi invaders, and German planes flew from Finnish bases to destroy Allied shipping and American and British merchantmen carrying supplies to Murmansk. In its second victory over Finland the Soviet Union again refrained from making any demands other than those required by security considerations.

The Baltic States, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, differed from Finland in that the overwhelming majority of their population was friendly to the Soviet Union, and knew that only as part of the Soviet Union could their economic and national interests develop. They, too, had received their independence after the Russian Revolution, and their native revolutions too had been put down with the help of German arms after World War I. They had been treated as colonies by Britain and Germany, and their fascist governments were subservient to Germany and in no way served the interests of their people. When these governments refused the mutual aid pacts the Soviet Government proposed for their joint security, their own people threw them out and elected new governments whose later request to become a part of the Soviet Union was overwhelmingly endorsed by the people of these states in the freest elections they had ever had. The fact that the interests of these states were closely bound up with those of Russia and could best be served as a part of it was stressed by American Secretary of State Colby after World War I. As part of the Soviet Union, the Baltic Republics have experienced unprecedented economic and cultural development since the end of World War II. The main source of propaganda to the contrary are the fascist elements of those states who collaborated with the German invaders and followed the Nazi armies when they were driven out of Soviet territory and who now make up a large part of the population of the DP camps.

Bessarabia was stolen from Russia by Romania after World War I, a theft which even the United States never recognized. The Soviet Union reincorporated Bessarabia after the Soviet armies had freed it from Nazi occupation, adding to it the small section of Northern Bukovina where the people were ethnically related and thus forming, together with related regions of the Ukraine, the new Soviet Republic of Moldavia.

The Koenigsburg area was incorporated by the Soviet Union in order to increase its security on the Baltic, by agreement with the Allies

under the ninety-year old Sophoulis. But this government has been sent home, and a War Council rules the country. Writes Mr. Gayn:

Real power has finally slipped into the waiting hands of General Alexander Papagos, Dictator Metaxas' friend and chief of staff, the King's Grand Chamberlain, and now commander-in-chief of the armed forces. . . . This year's government platform has been reduced to the single plank of military action.

Greeks bearing arms, including various groups outside the regular army, will in the coming year exceed the 280,000 supported by the United States Treasury at the end of 1948. Of these, one out of every four serves in the notorious rightist bands which, according to Mr. Gayn:

. . . Serve as a "shadow government," engaging—in the words of a leading Athens paper—in "plunder, arbitrary and compulsory taxation, unpunished assassination, arson, slaughter, ravishment and robbery."

Of the "legitimate government," Mr. Gayn writes:

. . . so great are its callousness and incompetence, so vast the profiteering and corruption, so cruel the rightist terror, that the people turn to the Communists. . . .

This is the net result of our anti-Communist policy in Greece, now to be extended on a global scale.

## The USSR and the Berlin Issue

The State Department has cited Soviet policies in Berlin as another reason making the North Atlantic Pact necessary, charging that the "blockade" imposed by the Soviet Union has "created a situation gravely endangering the peace."

The basic cause of the Berlin crisis was the decision of the Western Powers to set up a separate Western German state, in violation of the Potsdam agreement, thereby undermining the four power administration of Berlin, in the center of the Soviet zone, which drew its legality from the four-power administration of Germany as a whole.

When this move was followed by the unilateral introduction of a new currency by the Western Powers and the bringing of this currency into Berlin, threatening disruption of the economy both of greater Berlin and of the whole Soviet zone of Germany, the Soviet Union imposed traffic restrictions to protect the economy of its zone.

The Soviet Government offered to supply the needs of all Berlin, so there was never any need for the dramatic airlift that has been costing the United States about half a million dollars a day for operating expenses alone, not to mention the unnecessary loss of life involved.

When four-power discussions were held in Moscow last summer, Stalin himself participated and for the sake of agreement withdrew the original Soviet condition that traffic restrictions would be lifted if plans



for the building up of an army the economy of Turkey is in no position to sustain, adding to the impoverishment and repression of the people of Turkey, and bolstering with our military help a regime no honest person could call anything but a police state.

Our policy in Greece is perhaps the most flagrant example of the actual meaning of our postwar foreign policy. Our policy has failed miserably, even in its own terms, and yet not only do we continue to pour money and arms down the rathole, but now propose through the North Atlantic Pact to extend this disastrous policy to global dimensions.

It was Winston Churchill who first gave the order for armed intervention in Greece when, back in 1944, British tanks and planes and guns were ordered to Athens to shoot down the Greek patriots who had liberated their country by their own efforts and thus contributed greatly to the Allied cause. Through British armed force, these Greek patriots, comprising not only Communists but all democratic elements, who were known at the time to have the overwhelming support of the Greek people, were driven to the hills as "bandits" to be exterminated. Through British armed force the monarcho-fascist elements, the people who had collaborated with Hitler, were placed in positions of power where they were able to rig the subsequent elections in their own favor.

America took over Britain's role when President Truman promulgated his evil doctrine. American arms are upholding a monarcho-fascist, police regime in Greece. Greek living standards have plunged downward, repression and terror have mounted, trade unions and all democratic elements have been stamped out, but there are more guerrillas now than when we started. The guerrillas are supposed to be receiving support from Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, allegedly directed from the Soviet Union. No outside aid has ever been proved. The "evidence" of such aid adduced by the UN Balkan commission has been of such a flimsy nature that it would be thrown out of a reputable court.

The failure of our Greek policy was underscored in an unpublished firsthand report for the Congressional Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation by its counsel, Louis E. Wyman. According to a dispatch in the *New York Times*, April 10, the report denounced the Greek government as "reactionary and incompetent" and contrasted the "disruptively ostentatious" manner in which the over-numerous U.S. officials in Greece disport themselves, with the impoverishment and tragedy around them.

Mark Gayn, writing from Athens for the *New Republic* of April 4, drew a startling picture of the results of our policy in Greece. We have failed, he says, in both our avowed goals—economic recovery and destruction of the Communist forces. Having allied ourselves from the start with the Populist regime, which he calls "one of the most corrupt and brutal in Europe," we now find ourselves in the position of supporting an open military dictatorship. A new government has been set up

at the Potsdam conference, where both President Truman and Premier Attlee agreed to support this proposal at the final peace settlement.

Carpatho Ukraine, an area of 5,000 square miles which had been a part of Czechoslovakia but which ethnically, geographically and by the desires of its people was more closely associated with the Soviet Union, representing the only Ukrainian group still outside its borders, was incorporated in the Soviet Union after a plebiscite among the people overwhelmingly requested it, by a friendly agreement between Czechoslovakia and the USSR.

South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands were added to the Soviet Union as a result of agreement at the Yalta conference. All of Sakhalin Island had previously been a part of Russia until the southern part was awarded to Japan following the Russo-Japanese war, creating an artificial separation of the inhabitants of that island. The Kurile Islands, which had belonged to Japan, were a natural geographic extension of Kamchatka Peninsula, a part of the Soviet Union, and in Japanese hands offered a threat to the USSR.

This leaves only Tannu Tava, details of whose incorporation into the Soviet Union are little known. A small area in the Soviet Far East, surrounded on all sides by Soviet territory, it would seem obvious that its interests could be better served as a part of the Soviet Union than separated from it, and there is no evidence that its population had any desires to the contrary.

## The Myth of Indirect Aggression

Since the above facts make the case of Soviet expansionism through forcible acquisition of territory difficult indeed to prove, the anti-Soviet propagandists have fallen back on charges of "indirect" Soviet aggression through the Communist movement.

The controlling role played by the Communists in the countries of Eastern Europe today is not the result of aggression by the Soviet Union, either direct or indirect.

In a speech on March 20, Prof. Frederick L. Schuman put it this way:

Communists are not in control of Eastern Europe and the Balkans by virtue of successful Soviet aggression against these countries or Germany, but by virtue of unsuccessful German aggression against the Soviet Union.

Professor Schuman made a similar point with regard to Communist influence in China and a large part of Southeast Asia.

During the war it was Japanese aggression that threatened China, and since the war it has been American imperialism which has poured in arms and financial aid in a futile effort to bolster up the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek dictatorship in its civil war against the Chinese people. The Soviet



Union has meticulously observed the principle of non-intervention in Chinese affairs and no responsible American official has ever stated that the Chinese Communists and democratic forces received military or other aid from the Soviet Union. Indeed, former Secretary of State Marshall and many others have stated categorically that there have been no evidences of such aid. The only foreign arms the Chinese Communists have received have been the Japanese arms they captured themselves, and American arms, either seized or purchased from the Nationalist forces. Thus in the country where Communists control the largest area in the world and have the largest following outside of the Soviet Union itself, there is no basis for the charge of indirect aggression.

In all of the new people's democracies in Eastern Europe, whether they were allies of the democracies invaded by the Axis powers or puppets fighting on the Axis side, it was the Communists who were in the leadership of the resistance forces, thus winning the support of the majority of the population. Most of these countries had feudal, reactionary regimes in the past. The postwar elections which put Communists in leading government positions, were the freest and most democratic these countries had ever known. Opposition parties (except for the fascists) had full opportunity to reach the people and to put up their slates, winning some government posts, but nowhere a controlling role.

The new coalition regimes of these countries won overwhelming popular support through long overdue land reforms, extending to their people democratic rights they had never known, and encouragement of strong trade union movements. The nationalization of large scale industry has made possible economic plans for the reconstruction of war devastation and the building up of native industries most of them had been prevented from having by the larger powers who had treated them as semi-colonial areas.

Soviet foreign policies encouraged all these moves through mutual aid pacts and reciprocal trade agreements, while the Western powers have engaged in intrigues to bring reactionary regimes to power. These countries understood the importance of friendly relations with the Soviet Union for their future development and security. Of course the Soviet Union has done everything in its power to encourage friendly governments along its borders, having suffered quite enough from the use of hostile neighboring governments as springboards for invasion.

The case of Czechoslovakia is most often cited as the proof of Soviet "indirect aggression." The U. S. State Department has given as one of the main reasons for the North Atlantic Pact what they falsely term the "Communist overthrow of the free, democratic government of Czechoslovakia," allegedly directed by the Soviet Union.

The fact is, that the February 1948 events in Czechoslovakia were precipitated by the resignation from the government of a group of non-Com-

munist ministers who hoped thus to compel the late President Benes to form a new government without the Communists, which he refused to do, declaring that such a step would be inconceivable and against the interests of Czechoslovakia. The notoriously anti-Soviet British agent, Sir Robert Bruce Lockhart, wrote in *Foreign Affairs* for July, 1948, in an article entitled "The Czechoslovak Revolution," that in the event of trouble the Czechoslovak always remembered that he was a Slav, and continued:

This statement does not mean that the *coup d'etat* was dictated by Russia. In this connection too much importance has been attached to the presence in Prague of Zorin, the former Russian Ambassador. Although every Czech Communist knew that in a domestic clash he was sure of Russia's backing, the Communist coup was, in fact, a spontaneous and quickly organized counterstroke to a legitimate but inept tactical move by the anti-Communist ministers.

It is of course, incorrect to term the Czechoslovakian events a coup d'etat by the Communists. There was an attempted coup d'etat by the non-Communists, averted by Communist action. New non-Communist ministers were added to the Government, and the new government won the support of Parliament in which all parties were represented.

In a recent series of articles in *The Nation*, Alexander Werth stated that the present government had the overwhelming support of the people of Czechoslovakia.

All reliable observers agree that the rate of restoration and new building in the Eastern European democracies has far outstripped that of the Marshall Plan countries, whose economies and hence political policies are in bondage to the United States, which has held back their industrial development to create markets for its own goods.

It was direct American intervention in the internal affairs of France and Italy that caused the elimination of Communists from the government of these two countries. American intervention is part of the whole Marshall Plan program, which denies aid to any country whose government includes Communists and pursues policies friendly to the Soviet Union.

Supposed Soviet-directed aggression in Greece is also cited in the State Department documents, as well as "heavy pressure" exerted on Turkey.

It is quite true that the Soviet Union has sought to reach an agreement with Turkey on joint control of the Dardanelles in order to prevent a repetition of its use by enemy vessels against the Soviet Union as has so frequently happened in the past, although it has never been used for aggressive purposes by Russia. Turkey, supposedly "neutral" in the last world war, let German warships through to fight our Soviet ally in the Black Sea. Now it is the United States which through the operations of the Truman doctrine is exerting pressure on the Turkish government against the interests of our wartime ally. We are pouring in military aid